

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. The Amended Claims Comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, par. 2

The Examiner rejected claims 33-48 as indefinite on the grounds the claims cover both apparatus and method steps. During the phone interview, Applicants proposed an amendment to claim 33 to clarify that the code causes the claimed operations to be performed. The Examiner indicated that this amendment would likely overcome the indefiniteness rejection. Applicants made the proposed amendment of claim 33 and request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

2. The Amended Claims are Directed to Statutory Subject Matter

The Examiner rejected claims 1-48 as directed to non-statutory subject matter (35 U.S.C. §101). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Applicants amended method claim 1 to recite a “computerized method”. During the phone interview, the Examiner said that this amendment to claim 1 would likely overcome the Section 101 rejection with respect to the method claims.

During the phone interview, the Examiner indicated that system claims 17-32 comply with Section 101 in their current form because they recite “means” limitation.

During the phone interview, the Examiner indicated that the amendment to claim 33 to overcome the Section 112 rejection would also likely overcome the Section 101 rejection with respect to claims 33-48.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the amended claims comply with Section 101 and request withdrawal of this rejection.

3. Claims 1-10, 13, 15, 17-26, 29, 31, 33-42, 45, and 47 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

During the phone interview, the Examiner and Applicants discussed the prior art rejections. The Examiner said she would reconsider the patentability of the claims in view of Applicants arguments, which are set forth below.

Claims 1-10, 13, 15, 17-26, 29, 31, 33-42, 45, and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,681,243 to Putzolu et al. in view of U.S. No. 2002/0143949 to Rajarajan. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 17, and 33 concern enabling access to a plurality of service engines, wherein each service engine enables access to service resources, and require: providing a plurality of service class implementations for service engines from different vendors, wherein each service class implementation provides an implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class; instantiating a service object for one service engine in response to at least one called method from one of the service class implementations, wherein the service object includes information on the service engine; receiving a method call from one service class implementation requesting information on service engine resources for one named service; and using the service object to access the requested information to return to the method call.

The Examiner cited the Abstract and col. 7, line 41 to col. 8, line 10 as teaching the claim requirement of providing a plurality of service class implementations for service engines from different vendors, wherein each service class implementation provides an implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class. (Second Office Action, pg. 4)
Applicants traverse:

The cited cols. 7-8 mention providing an interface to agents including services. Services are Java classes instantiated as objects that have methods that accept inputs from agents and allow agents to access resources. Each resource on a network is accessible by agents via a service, such as the hard disk drive on each device is accessible by a disk service type.

Although the cited cols. 7-8 mention the user of service classes that allow agents to access resources, nowhere do the cited cols. 7-8 teach or suggest providing service class implementations of a same abstract service class from different vendors as claimed. In fact, cols. 7-8 teach away from this requirement because the cited cols. 7-8 mention that “[d]ifferent types of services provide access to underlying resources in a different manner and interface with agents in a different manner” and that “the actual service class used by an agent to access a service type on each device may be different”. Thus, cols. 7-8 do not teach service class implementations from different vendors providing an implementation from a same abstract service class. Instead, the cited cols. 7-8 mention how services for different resources use different types of services and service classes, not implementations of the same abstract service class as claimed.

Moreover, the cited cols. 7-8 also nowhere teach or suggest service class implementations for service engines from different vendors. The cited cols. 7-8 mention different types of services for different resources. Nowhere do the cited cols. 7-8 teach, suggest or mention service class implementations from a same abstract service class for different vendors as claimed.

The cited Abstract discusses allowing agents to function on devices having resources and that agents may move from an environment on one device to an environment on another device. Nowhere does the cited Abstract teach or suggest providing service class implementations of a same abstract service class from different vendors as claimed.

After citing cols. 7-8 of Putzolo as teaching the claim requirements that each service class implementation provides an implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class, the Examiner subsequently states that Putzolo does not disclose this claim requirement. (Second Office Action, pg. 5) The Examiner further cited pg. 2, para. [0011]; pg. 12, para. [0101]; pg. 7, paras. [0072]-[0074]; and pg. 20, para. [0175] of Rajarajan as teaching the claim requirements not taught in Putzolo. (Second Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants submit that the cited Rajarajan also fails to teach or suggest the claim requirement of providing a plurality of service class implementations for service engines from different vendors, wherein each service class implementation provides an implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class.

The cited para. [0011] mentions managing a plurality of resources and receiving information from resources related to different tasks. A method stores information from one resource in association with another resources. The cited para. [0101] mentions that a task handler address is used to generate a request to collect dynamic tasks and that dynamic task information relates to functions that may be performed on a data object. The cited paras. [0072]-[0074] mentions that a configuration manager communicates with resources added to the system to configure the resources for management. The configuration manager also provides other managers information related to the added resource to communicate with that resource. The configuration manager may be a web service having methods other managers may use to get information about the resources.

Although the cited Rajarajan discusses providing access to resources, the cited Rajarajan nowhere teaches the claim requirements of enabling access to different resources or services by providing a plurality of service class implementations for service engines from different vendors,

wherein each service class implementation provides an implementation of methods and objects from a same abstract service class.

Moreover, the cited para. [0175] discusses a different technique than claimed for providing access to resources. The cited para. [0175] discusses a framework to allow an administrator to work with a group of objects without first having to navigate to the application associated with the object. The framework allows users to navigate directly to the object. The cited Rajarajan provides access to resources through a configuration manager that configures the resources to allow access and management of the resources. (para. [0072]).

Again, the cited Rajarajan nowhere teaches or suggests enabling access to different resources or services by providing a plurality of service class implementations for service engines from different vendors. Instead, the cited Rajarajan discusses a technique of registering resources to provide access to the resources.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 17, and 33 are patentable over the cited art because the cited combination does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2-16, 18-32, and 34-48 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art. The below discussed dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art for the reasons discussed.

Amended claims 3, 19, and 35 depend from claims 1, 17, and 33 and further require that the service engines include workflow products from different vendors, wherein the workflow products comprise computer programs enabling implementation of a computer implemented workflow defining a series of processes to be performed by users at computers with respect to a computer implemented work item.

Applicants amended these claims per the request of the Examiner to provide further definition for the “workflow”. These claims now recite that the workflow products comprise computer programs enabling implementation of a computer implemented workflow defining a series of processes to be performed by users at computers with respect to a computer implemented work item. These additional requirements concerning the definition of a workflow are disclosed in the Application at pgs. 1-2, para. [0003] and pgs. 7- 9, para. [0018]-[0024].

The Examiner cited pg. 20, para. [0175] from Rajarajan as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Second Office Action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

The cited para. [0175] mentions locating and working with objects of differing types without having to navigate through varying applications. Instead of requiring the user to navigate to an application and then to a group of objects, the framework allows the user to navigate directly to the object and perform all tasks associated with the object. Nowhere in the cited para. [0175] is there any teaching, suggestion or mention of service engines including workflow products from different vendors, where workflow products comprise computer programs enabling implementation of a computer implemented workflow defining a series of processes to be performed by users at computers with respect to a computer implemented work item.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of claims 3, 19, and 35 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 4, 20, and 36 depend from claims 3, 19, and 35 and further require that the workflow service class implementations from different vendors each includes methods and objects from a same abstract workflow service class specifying methods and objects to include in all workflow service class implementations.

The Examiner further cited pg. 2, para. [0011], pg. 12, para. [0101], and pg. 7, paras. [0072]-[0074] of Rajarajan as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Second Office Action, 6) Applicants traverse.

The cited para. [0011] mentions managing a plurality of resources, and receiving information from resources related to different tasks, but where the different tasks are associated with a same object type. A method stores information from one resource in association with another resources. The cited para. [0101] mentions that a task handler address is used to generate a request to collect dynamic tasks and that dynamic task information relates to functions that may be performed on a data object. The cited paras. [0072]-[0074] mention that a configuration manager communicates with resources added to the system to configure the resources for management. The configuration manager also provides other managers information related to the added resource to communication with that resource. The

configuration manager may be a web service having methods other managers may use to get information about the resources.

Nowhere do the above cited paragraphs of Rajarajan teach or suggest workflow service class implementations from different vendors including methods and objects from a same abstract workflow service class specifying methods and objects to include in all workflow service class implementations. The cited paras. 72-74 discuss how a configuration manager configures and registers resources, and provides a web service to allow access to information about the resources. However, there is still no teaching, suggestion or mention of the claim requirement of workflow service class implementations from different vendors including methods and objects from a same abstract workflow service class.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of claims 3, 19, and 35 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Applicants further submit that the additional requirements of other of the dependent claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of distinction over the cited art.

4. Claims 11, 12, 14, 16, 27, 28, 30, 32, 43, 44, 46, and 48 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 12, 14, 16, 27, 28, 30, 32, 43, 44, 46, and 48 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103(a)) over Wollrath (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,607). Applicants traverse.

Applicants submit that the cited claims 11, 12, 14, 16, 27, 28, 30, 32, 43, 44, 46, and 48 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 17, and 33, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of distinction over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicants submit that the pending claims 1-48 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: October 13, 2005

By: _____

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984